

## **Wichita-Sedgwick County Comprehensive Plan Steering Committee Meeting**

MAPC Large Conference Room, 10<sup>th</sup> Floor, City Hall

4:00-6:00 p.m., October 8, 2014

### ***Discussion Highlights & Points of Agreement:***

#### *Attendance - Plan Steering Committee:*

Stacy Christie, Mitch Coffman, David Foster, Bryan Frye, Julie Hedrick, Joe Johnson, Ken Lee, John McKay, Cindy Miles, Randy Oliver, Bill Ramsey, Gary Schmitt, Debra Miller Stevens

#### *Attendance - Project Staff:*

Dave Barber, Scott Knebel, Jess McNeely, John Schlegel, Scott Wadle

#### *Attendance - Developer Guest Panel:*

David Farha, Bree Kelly, Jay Russell, John McKay, Jason Van Sickle, Tony Zimbelman

### **1. Welcome -**

The meeting was called to order by Cindy Miles (Susan Estes not able to make the meeting) and followed by introductions of all present.

### **2. Committee Discussion Forum with Local Developers on Wichita Urban Infill Issues -**

To assist with the development of a Wichita Urban Infill Strategy, the following local developers were invited by staff to meet with the Committee and share their experiences and insights related to urban residential infill development in the Established Central Area (ECA) of Wichita. The panel was comprised of the following individuals: David Farha, Bree Kelly, Jay Russell, John McKay, Jason Van Sickle, and Tony Zimbelman. To provide context for the panel discussion, Jess McNeely gave a brief presentation of relevant urban infill trends data and information in Wichita.

The following is a summary of some key takeaways gleaned from the Committee's discussion with the local infill developer's:

- Determine those areas where mixed zoning classifications within a neighborhood would be appropriate (spot re-zoning requests are not typically approved). Zoning regulations need to be more enabling and facilitating of urban infill development (e.g. neighbors filing a protest petition before the rezoning case actually goes to the MAPC).
- Need support of local councilmember, otherwise the project won't happen.
- Land assembly is difficult – need to set up multiple companies to acquire properties (otherwise, price inflates).
- A sense of community (churches, schools, parks, etc.) is important to people who are considering residing in the ECA.
- Local property owners in older-infrastructure neighborhoods don't want to pay for their portion of any infrastructure upgrades (e.g. roads) typically required to support an infill redevelopment project.
- The City's NRA (neighborhood revitalization area) incentives have made the difference for small-time developers doing duplex redevelopment on vacant lots within NRA area neighborhoods. Need to better align NRA boundaries to incentivize infill in the ECA.
- Financing issues:
  - All low-moderate income housing should be developed by not-for-profit organizations (very difficult for a for-profit developer to make the numbers work).
  - Federal subsidies are diminishing (HUD) but they are the only way by which a developer can make the financing work on new home construction in appraised 'low-value' older neighborhoods in the ECA.
  - Tighter credit score requirements by lending institutions has eliminated the majority of prospective/interested candidates for federally-subsidized home ownership programs.
  - Private/public partnerships are important to solving the finance and funding issues

- Physical property constraints (aging infrastructure, buried building foundations, utility placements, curb cuts, etc.) increase costs for infill development.
- Appraisal issues – appraisals won't support/reflect the actual construction value of a new home if it is surrounded by older homes with lower appraised values. Creating an entire block of new homes is one way of overcoming this appraised valuation problem.
- Local infill developers would benefit if government provided a repository of current information regarding available vacant properties as well as a concise summary guide of local, state and federal incentives available for infill development.
- Ultimately, urban infill is market-driven. Accordingly, market research needs to be done (as was done for Downtown Wichita) to verify infill-housing demand in the ECA.

### **3. Highlights from September 17<sup>th</sup> 'Fuel the Fire' Speaker Series -**

Bryan Frye provided the Committee with the highlights and takeaways he heard from the presentation by James Chung regarding Wichita's future threats and opportunities as a community. Key ingredients to our future will be the retention and attraction of talent, and increasing the percentage of post-secondary education achievement levels among our residents.

### **4. Continue Committee Work on Public Safety Plan Element -**

Staff took the Committee through an exercise where each Committee member wrote possible public safety plan goal and strategy ideas on cards which were then posted on the wall. Using sticky dots, Committee members individually voted for their top public safety plan goal and strategy ideas (the results of this exercise are summarized under separate attachment). Staff will utilize this input in developing a set of public safety plan goals and strategies for consideration at the next Committee meeting.

### **5. Continue Committee Work on Funding and Financing Plan Element -**

Staff took the Committee through an exercise where each Committee member wrote possible funding and financing plan goal and strategy ideas on cards which were then posted on the wall. Using sticky dots, Committee members individually voted for their top funding and financing plan goal and strategy ideas (the results of this exercise are summarized under separate attachment). Staff will utilize this input in developing a set of funding and financing plan goals and strategies for consideration at the next Committee meeting.

### **6. Continue Committee Work on Plan Implementation -**

Barber briefly reviewed a proposed approach to successfully implementing the Plan and measuring its success. The Plan Implementation element is comprised of two parts;

Part 1. Infrastructure Investment Decision-making Framework;

Part 2. Plan Monitoring, Review and Amendment

The Committee members expressed general support for the draft material as presented but requested additional time to review the draft material in more detail. Additional discussion on this Plan element will occur at the next Committee meeting.

### **7. Introduce Work on Arts, Culture and Recreation Plan Element -**

Deferred to the next Committee meeting due to insufficient time.

### **8. Next Committee Meeting - October 22, 2014**

### **9. Comments from Public Attendees -**

- Important to remember that markets create jobs

### **10. Adjourned - 6:00 p.m.**